arXiv:1506.07489v1 [math.LO] 24 Jun 2015

Indiscernible arrays and rational functions with algebraic constraint

ELAD LEVI

June 25, 2015

Abstract. Let k be an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero and $P(x,y) \in k[x,y]$ be a polynomial which depends on all its variables. P has an algebraic constraint if the set $\{(P(a,b),(P(a',b'),P(a',b),P(a,b') \,|\, a,a',b,b' \in k\}$ does not have the maximal Zariski-dimension. Tao proved that if P has an algebraic constraint then it can be decomposed: there exists $Q,F,G \in k[x]$ such that $P(x_1,x_2) = Q(F(x_1)+G(x_2))$, or $P(x_1,x_2) = Q(F(x_1)\cdot G(x_2))$. In this paper we give an answer to a question raised by Hrushovski and Zilber regarding 3-dimensional indiscernible arrays in stable theories. As an application of this result we find a decomposition of rational functions in three variables which has an algebraic constraint.

1 Introduction

Rational functions with an algebraic constraint

Let k be an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero, and let $r(x_1,...,x_n) \in k(x_1,..,x_n)$ be a rational function. For every $(v_1^0,..,v_n^0,v_1^1,..,v_n^1) \in k^{2n}$ let

$$L_r(v_1^0,..,v_n^0,v_1^1,..,v_n^1) = (r(v_1^0,..,v_n^0), r(v_1^1,v_2^0,..,v_n^0),..,r(v_1^1,.,v_n^1)) \in k^{2^n}.$$

$r(x_1,..,x_n)$ has an algebraic constraint if the set $A_r = \{L_r(v_1^0,..,v_n^0,v_1^1,..,v_n^1) \,|\; v_1^0,..,v_n^1 \in k\}$ has Zariski dimension less then $2n$. We will say that $r(x_1,..,x_n)$ is non-degenerate, if $r(v_1,..,v_n) \notin k(v_{i_1},..,v_{i_{n-1}})$ for every algebraic independent set $\{v_1,..,v_n\} \subset k$ and every $i_1,..,i_{n-1} \in \{1,..,n\}$.

Tao proved in [1](Theorem 41) that in case $r(x_1,x_2) \in k[x_1,x_2]$ is a non-degenerate polynomial with an algebraic constraint, then there exists $Q,F,G \in k[x]$ such that either $r(x_1,x_2) = Q(F(x_1)+G(x_2))$, or $r(x_1,x_2) = Q(F(x_1)\cdot G(x_2))$. Hrushovski [2] observed that this theorem can also be proved by the celebrated Group Configuration theorem (see [3] for more information about this theorem). He managed to prove that if $r(x_1,x_2) \in k(x_1,x_2)$ is a non-degenerate rational function with an algebraic constraint, then there exist a one dimensional algebraic group $(G,*)$, rational maps $\overline{r} \in k(x_1,x_2)$, $\pi \in k(x_1)$, and $f,g,h,q:\ k \to G$ such that: $\pi \circ \overline{r} = r$ and $q \circ \overline{r}(u_1,u_2) = g(u_1) * h(u_2)$.

In this paper we focus on rational functions in three variables that are non-degenerate and have algebraic constraint. In section 6 we prove the following result:

Theorem 1.1. *Let $P(x, y, z)$ be a rational function over an algebraically closed field k of characteristic zero. If P is non-degenerate and has an algebraic constraint, then one of the following holds:*

1. *There exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$, rational functions r_1, r_2, r_3, q, π and $\overline{P} \in k(x, y, z)$ such that for some $i \neq j \neq l \in \{1, 2, 3\}$: $q \circ \overline{P}(x_1, x_2, x_3) = r_i(x_i)(r_j(x_j) + r(x_l))^n$ and $\pi \circ \overline{P}(x, y, z) = P(x, y, z)$.*
2. *There exists rational functions $r_1, r_2, r_3, q, \pi \in k(x)$ and $\overline{P} \in k(x, y, z)$ such that: $q \circ \overline{P}(x, y, z) = \frac{r_1(x)+r_2(y)}{r_2(y)+r_3(z)}$ and $\pi \circ \overline{P}(x, y, z) = P(x, y, z)$.*
3. *There exists a one dimension algebraic group $(G, *)$, rational maps r_1, r_2, r_3, q, π* and $\overline{P}$ such that: $q \circ \overline{P}(x, y, z) = r_1(x) * r_2(y) * r_3(z)$ and $\pi \circ \overline{P}(x, y, z) = P(x, y, z)$.

In particular, we use this theorem to find a family of rational functions (definition 6.8) that has an algebraic constraint. Our proof of this theorem is based on Hrushovski's ideas; these lead us to the main topic of this paper.

Indiscernible arrays

Let M be a model, an array of elements: $F = (f_{i,j})_{i,j\in\mathbb{N}} \subset M$ is an indiscernible array if for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and every natural numbers $i_1 < i_2 < .. < i_n$, $j_1 < j_2 < .. < j_n$ we have:

$$tp(f_{t,k} \,|\, 1 \leq t, k \leq n) = tp(f_{i_t, j_k} \,|\, 1 \leq t, k \leq n).$$

In the case where M is strongly minimal we can use Morely rank to define the rank function of the indiscernible array: $\alpha_F(m, n) = RM(f_{i,j} \,|\, 1 \leq i \leq m,\ 1 \leq j \leq n)$.

Hrushovski and Zilber used [4](6.3) the Group Configuration theorem to prove that if $\alpha_F(m, n) = \lambda m + n - \lambda$ then F is induced by a definable action of definable group of Morely rank λ. Hrushovski and Zilber made a prediction [4](6.5) for the possibilities of a 3-dimension indiscernible array with rank function $\alpha_F(m, n.p) = m + n + p - 2$. In this paper we show another possibility that was not considered by Hrushovski and Zilber (section 3). However, we prove (sections 4-5) that this possibility is the only exception. In the next section we give the basic definitions, and describe precisely the main problem that we wish to answer.

Acknowledgments

The author is greatly indebted to Ehud Hrushovski for his guidance and for sharing his ideas, and Yatir Halevi for a careful reading of an earlier draft. The research leading to this paper has been partially supported by the European Research Council under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013)/ERC Grant Agreement No. 291111

2 Preliminaries

Let T be a stable theory, we work inside a monster model $\mathcal{U} \vDash T$ (a big saturated model) in which $acl(\emptyset) = dcl(\emptyset)$.
We denote the Morley rank by RM, and use $\downarrow$ to denote the non-forking independence relation.

Definition 2.1.

1. $F = (f_{i^1,...,i^n})_{i^1,..,i^n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{U}$ is an n indiscernible array if $RM(f_{i^1,...,i^n}) = 1$ and for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$, every $j^t_1 < j^t_2 < ... < j^t_m$ (where $1 \leq t \leq n$); tp($f_{j^1_{i_1},..,j^n_{i_n}}$ $|$ 1$\leq$ i_1,..,i_n $\leq$m)=tp($f_{i_1,..,i_n}$ $|$ 1$\leq$ i_1,..,i_n $\leq$m).
2. For every n indiscernible array $F = (f_{i^1,...,i^n})_{i^1,..,i^n \in \mathbb{N}}$ we define the rank function:
$$\alpha_F(m_1, .., m_n) = RM(f_{i^1,..,i^n} \,|\, 1 \leq i^j \leq m_j,\ 1 \leq j \leq n).$$
3. We say that two n indiscernible arrays $F = (f_{i^1,...,i^n})_{i^1,..,i^n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $F' = (f'_{i^1,...,i^n})_{i^1,..,i^n \in \mathbb{N}}$ are algebraically equivalent, if for every $i^1, .., i^n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have: $acl(f_{i^1,..,i^n}) = acl(f'_{i^1,..,i^n})$.

In this paper we only focus on 2 and 3 indiscernible arrays. We call 2 indiscernible arrays simply indiscernible arrays.

As mentioned in [4](6.2), there is a polynomial $p \in \mathbb{Z}[x, y, z]$ such that $p(m, n, r) = \alpha_F(m, n, r)$ for large enough m, n, r. A special case is when $F = (f_{i,j})$ is an indiscernible array with $\alpha_F(m, n) = \lambda m + n - \lambda$, in this case Hrushovski and Zilber used the celebrated Group Configuration theorem in order to prove the following useful theorem:

Fact 2.2. [4](6.3) *Let $F = (f_{i,j})$ be an indiscernible array.*

1. *If $\alpha_F(m, n) = m + n - 1$ then there exists a definable one dimensional group $(G, \cdot)$ and elements $\{b_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}, \{a_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subset G$ such that $acl(f_{i,j}) = acl(a_i \cdot b_j)$ for every $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$.*
2. *If $\alpha_F(m, n) = 2m+n-2$ then there exists a definable field $(\mathbb{F}, +, \cdot)$ and elements $\{b_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$,$\{a_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$,$\{c_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{F}$ such that $acl(f_{i,j}) = acl(a_i \cdot c_j + b_j)$ for every $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Definition 2.3. Let $F = (f_{i,j,k})$ be a 3 indiscernible array.

1. We say that F has the group form if there exists a definable one dimensional group $(G, \cdot)$ and elements $\{b_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}, \{a_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}, \{c_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset G$ such that $acl(f_{i,j,k}) = acl(a_i \cdot b_j \cdot c_k)$.
2. We say that F has the field form if there exists a definable field $(\mathbb{F}, +, \cdot)$, elements $\{a^1_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$,$\{a^2_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$,$\{a^3_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{F}$, and some permutation $\sigma \in S_3$ such that $acl(f_{i_1,i_2,i_3}) = acl(a^{\sigma(1)}_{i_{\sigma(1)}} \cdot (a^{\sigma(2)}_{i_{\sigma(2)}} + a^{\sigma(3)}_{i_{\sigma(3)}}))$ for every $i_1, i_2, i_3 \in \mathbb{N}$.
3. We say that F has the twisted form if there exists a definable field $(\mathbb{F}, +, \cdot)$ and an independent set $\{a^1_i, a^2_j, a^3_k \,|\, i, j, k \in \mathbb{N}\} \subset \mathbb{F}$ such that: acl(f_{i_1,i_2,i_3})=acl($\frac{a^1_i+a^2_j}{a^3_k+a^2_j}$) for every $i, j, k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Hrushovski and Zilber asked [4](6.5) the following question:

Problem 2.4. Let $F = (f_{i,j,k})$ be a 3 indiscernible array with rank function $\alpha_F(m, n, k) = m+n+k-2$. Are the following the only possibilities?

1. F has the group form.
2. F has the field form.

In the next section we give a negative answer to this problem, in other words, there is another case which was not considered- the twisted form. However, the twisted form is the only exception. The main purpose of this paper is to prove the following theorem:

Theorem 2.5. *Let $F = (f_{i,j,k})$ be a 3 indiscernible array and suppose that $\alpha_F(m,n,k) = m+n+k-2$, then there are only three possibilities:*

1. *F has the group form.*
2. *F has the field form.*
3. *F has the twisted form.*

3 The twisted form- A counterexample

In this section we will see that that the twisted form is really a counterexample. We start with some basic fact regarding indiscernible arrays:

Lemma 3.1. *Indiscernible arrays have the following properties:*

1. *Let $F = (f_{i,j,k})$ be a 3 indiscernible array array, then α_F (m,n,k)=m+n+k-2 iff*

$$\alpha_F(1,m,n) = \alpha_F(m,1,n) = \alpha_F(m,n,1) = m+n-1.$$

2. *Let $F = (f_{i,j})$ be an indiscernible array, then $\alpha_F(m,n) = m+n-1$ iff $RM(f_{1,1}, f_{1,2}, f_{2,1}, f_{2,2}) = 3$.*

Proof.

1. The left to right direction is trivial. For the other direction, assume

$$\alpha_F(1,m,n) = \alpha_F(m,1,n) = \alpha_F(m,n,1) = m+n-1.$$

We have: $\alpha_F(2,1,2) = 3$, thus by indiscernibility: $f_{i,1,k} \in acl(f_{1,1,1}, f_{1,1,k}, f_{i,1,1})$ for every $2 \leq k$. We also know from $\alpha_F(1,m,n) = m+n-1$ and indiscernibility that:

$$f_{i,j,k} \in acl(f_{i,j,1}, f_{i,1,k}, f_{i,1,1}).$$

In conclusion, for every $m,n,p \in \mathbb{N}$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\alpha(m,n,p) = RM((f_{i,j,k} \,|\, 1 \leq i \leq m, \quad 1 \leq j \leq n, \quad 1 \leq k \leq p)) = \\
&RM(f_{i,j,1} \,|\, 1 \leq i \leq m, \quad 1 \leq j \leq n) + \\
&+RM((f_{i,j,k} \,|\, 1 \leq i \leq m, \quad 1 \leq j \leq n, \quad 2 \leq k \leq p)/(f_{i,j,1} \,|\, 1 \leq i \leq m, \quad 1 \leq j \leq n)) = \\
&m+n-1+RM((f_{1,1,k} \,|\, 2 \leq k \leq p)/(f_{i,j,1} \,|\, 1 \leq i \leq m, \quad 1 \leq j \leq n)) = \\
&m+n+p-2
\end{aligned}$$

2. Again, we only need to prove the direction from right to left: If RM($f_{1,1}$,$f_{1,2}$,$f_{2,1}$,$f_{2,2}$)=3 then by indiscernibility for every $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$: $RM(f_{1,i}, f_{1,1}, f_{j,1}, f_{i,j}) = 3$, thus $f_{i,j} \in acl(f_{1,i}, f_{1,1}, f_{j,1})$ and we get for every $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\begin{aligned} &\alpha(m,n) = RM((f_{i,j} \,|\, 1 \leq i \leq m, \quad 1 \leq j \leq n)) = \\ &RM(f_{i,1} \,|\, 1 \leq i \leq m) + RM((f_{i,j} \,|\, 1 \leq i \leq m, \quad 2 \leq j \leq n)/(f_{i,1} \,|\, 1 \leq i \leq m)) = \\ &m + RM((f_{1,j} \,|\, 2 \leq j \leq n)/(f_{i,1} \,|\, 1 \leq i \leq m)) = m + n - 1 \end{aligned}$$

□

The following lemma proves that every 3 indiscernible array which has the twisted form satisfies the assumptions of problem 2.4:

Lemma 3.2. *Let $F = (f_{i,j,k})$ be a 3 indiscernible array, if F has the twisted form then* $\alpha_F(m, n, k) = m + n + k - 2$.

Proof. Let $(\mathbb{F}, +, \cdot)$ be a field, $\{v_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}, \{u_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}, \{w_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{F}$ such that: acl($f_{i,j,k}$)=acl($\frac{u_i+v_j}{v_j+w_k}$) for every $i, j, k \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $t_{i,j,k} = \frac{u_i+v_j}{v_j+w_k}$. By Lemma 3.1(1) it will suffice to show that

$$\alpha_F(1, m, n) = \alpha_F(m, 1, n) = \alpha_F(m, n, 1) = m + n - 1.$$

Notice that:

1. $\frac{t_{2,1,1}}{t_{1,1,1}} = \frac{\frac{u_2+v_1}{v_1+w_1}}{\frac{u_1+v_1}{v_1+w_1}} = \frac{u_2+v_1}{u_1+v_1} = \frac{\frac{u_2+v_1}{v_1+w_2}}{\frac{u_1+v_1}{v_1+w_2}} = \frac{t_{2,1,2}}{t_{1,1,2}}.$

2. $\frac{t_{2,1,1}-1}{t_{1,1,1}-1} = \frac{\frac{u_2-w_1}{v_1+w_1}}{\frac{u_1-w_1}{v_1+w_1}} = \frac{u_2-w_1}{u_1-w_1} = \frac{\frac{u_2-w_1}{v_2+w_1}}{\frac{u_1-w_1}{v_2+w_1}} = \frac{t_{2,2,1}-1}{t_{1,2,1}-1}.$

3. $\frac{t^{-1}_{1,1,2}-1}{t^{-1}_{1,1,1}-1} = \frac{\frac{v_1+w_2}{u_1+v_1}-1}{\frac{v_1+w_1}{u_1+v_1}-1} = \frac{w_2-u_1}{w_1-u_1} = \frac{\frac{v_2+w_2}{u_1+v_2}-1}{\frac{v_2+w_1}{u_1+v_2}-1} = \frac{t^{-1}_{1,2,2}-1}{t^{-1}_{1,2,1}-1}.$

Combining lemma 3.1(2) with (1)+(2)+(3) we get: $\alpha_F(1, m, n) = \alpha_F(m, 1, n) = \alpha_F(m, n, 1) = m + n - 1$ as desired.

□

In order to show that the twisted form is a counterexample to Problem 2.4, we must find a dividing line which will separate the forms in Definition 2.3.

Definition 3.3. Let $F = (f_{i,j,k})$ be a 3 indiscernible array such that each element has Morley rank 1.

1. l is a line in F if $l = \{f_{i,j,k}.f_{i',j',k'}\}$ for some $(i, j, k) \neq (i', j', k') \in \mathbb{N}^3$.

2. The unit cube of F is $A = \{f_{i,j,k} \,|\, 1 \leq i, j, k \leq 2\}$.

3. A frame to the unit cube is one of the following sets of lines:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_1 &= \{\{f_{1,1,1}, f_{1,1,2}\}, \{f_{1,2,1}, f_{1,2,2}\}, \{f_{2,1,1}, f_{2,1,2}\}, \{f_{2,2,1} f_{2,2,2}\}\} \\ \mathcal{I}_2 &= \{\{f_{1,1,1}, f_{1,2,1}\}, \{f_{1,1,2}, f_{1,2,2}\}, \{f_{2,1,1}, f_{2,2,1}\}, \{f_{2,1,2} f_{2,2,2}\}\} \\ \mathcal{I}_3 &= \{\{f_{1,1,1}, f_{2,1,1}\}, \{f_{1,2,1}, f_{2,2,1}\}, \{f_{1,1,2}, f_{2,1,2}\}, \{f_{1,2,2} f_{2,2,2}\}\} \end{aligned}$$

4. For every frame to the unit cube $\mathcal{I}$,we define the base to the frame to be: $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{I}} = \bigcap_{l \in \mathcal{I}} acl(l)$. Let $RM(\mathcal{C}_j) := max\{RM(g) \,|\, g \in acl(\mathcal{C}_j)\}$.

Remark 3.4. If $F = (f_{i,j,k})$ is a 3 indiscernible array and $l_1 \neq l_2$ are two lines in F, then $RM(l_1, l_2) > 2$, otherwise $acl(l_1) = acl(l_2)$; in contradiction to the fact that F is a 3 indiscernible array. Hence, if we take three different lines l_1, l_2, l_3 , with $e \in acl(l_1) \cap acl(l_2) \cap acl(l_3)$, $e' \in acl(l_1) \cap acl(l_2)$ and $e'' \in acl(l_1) \cap acl(l_3)$, such that $RM(e) = RM(e') = RM(e'') = 1$ then we must have: $acl(e) = acl(e') = acl(e'')$.

We can differentiate between the three forms in definition 2.3 by the Morley rank of the bases to the frames.

Lemma 3.5. *Let $F = (f_{i,j,k})$ be a 3 indiscernible array.*

1. *If F has the group form, then for every frame to the unit cube $\mathcal{I}$ we have: $RM(\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{I}}) = 1$.*
2. *If F has the field form, then there is exactly one frame to the unit cube $\mathcal{I}$ such that: $RM(\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{I}}) = 1$.*
3. *If F has the twisted form, then for every frame to the unit cube $\mathcal{I}$ we have: $RM(\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{I}}) = 0$.*

Proof. (1)+(2) are trivial; we prove (3):
Let $f'_{i,j,k} = \frac{u_i+v_j}{v_j+w_k}$, then $\frac{u_2+v_1}{u_1+v_1} \in acl(f'_{1,1,1}, f'_{2,1,1}) \cap acl(f'_{2,1,2}, f'_{1,1,2})$, on the other hand:

$$\frac{f'_{2,1,1} - 1}{f'_{1,1,1} - 1} = \frac{u_2 - w_1}{u_1 - w_1} = \frac{f'_{2,2,1} - 1}{f'_{1,2,1} - 1} \in acl(f'_{2,1,1}, f'_{1,1,1}) \cap acl(f'_{2,2,1}, f'_{1,2,1}).$$

Suppose there is an element $g \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $RM(g) = 1$ and $g \in \bigcap_{l \in \mathcal{I}_3} acl(l)$, then by remark 3.4 $acl(\frac{u_2-w_1}{u_1-w_1}) = acl(\frac{u_2+v_1}{u_1+v_1})$, but $acl(\frac{u_2-w_1}{u_1-w_1}) = acl(\frac{u_2-u_1}{u_1-w_1})$ and $acl(\frac{u_2+v_1}{u_1+v_1}) = acl(\frac{u_2-u_1}{u_1+v_1})$ and we have: $w_1 \in acl(u_1, u_2, v_1)$ in contradiction to the assumption that $\{w_1, u_1, u_2, v_1\}$ is an independent set.

The proof that there is no element $g \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $RM(g) = 1$ and $g \in \bigcap_{l \in \mathcal{I}_i} acl(l)$ for $1 \leq i \leq 2$ is the same as the proof for $\mathcal{I}_3$ if we replace $f'_{i,j,k}$ by $\widehat{f'_{i,j,k}} = (f'_{i,j,k})^{-1}$ for $\mathcal{I}_1$ and $\overline{f'_{i,j,k}} = (f'_{i.j.k} - 1)^{-1}$ for $\mathcal{I}_2$. □

We conclude this section with the following corollary which answers Problem 2.4:

Corollary 3.6. *Let $\mathbb{F}$ be a definable algebraic closed field, and let $\{a^1_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}, \{a^2_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}, \{a^3_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{F}$, where $\{a^1_i, a^2_j, a^3_k \,|\, i, j, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is an algebraic independent set. Define $f_{i,j,k} = \frac{a^1_i + a^2_j}{a^3_k + a^2_j}$, then $F = (f_{i,j,k})$ is a counterexample to problem 2.4.*

Proof. F is a 3 indiscernible array (because of the indiscerniblity of the set $\{a^1_i, a^2_j, a^3_k \,|\, i, j, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$). By lemma 3.2, $\alpha_F(m, n, p) = m + n + p - 2$, and by lemma 3.5, F neither has the group form nor the field form. □

4 Indiscernible arrays generated by definable fields

In this section we prove some basic facts about indiscernible arrays generated by fields or groups.

Lemma 4.1. *Let* $(\mathbb{F}, \cdot, +)$ *be a definable field, and* $F = (f_{i,j})$ *an indiscernible array such that* $f_{i,j}{=}a_i \cdot c_j {+} b_j$*, where* $b_j \in acl(c_j)$*,* $b_1 = 0$ *and* $c_1 = 1$*, then there exists an element* $k \in acl(\emptyset) \cap \mathbb{F}$ *such that* $f_{i,j} = a_i c_j + k(c_j - 1)$*.*

Proof. Let $v_{k,l} = \frac{c_l}{c_k}$ and $t_{k,l} = c_k - v_{k.l} \cdot c_l$. If $t_{k,l} = 0$ for some $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$, then by indiscerniblity it is true for every k, l, thus: $f_{i,j} = a_i c_j$. Hence, we may assume $t_{k,l} \neq 0$. On the other hand: $v_{k,l} = \frac{f_{1,l} - f_{2,l}}{f_{1,k} - f_{2,k}}$ and $t_{k,l} = f_{1,k} - f_{1,l} \cdot v_{k,l}$, thus: (1) $v_{k,l}, t_{k,l} \in dcl(f_{i,j} \mid \ j \in \{l, k\}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq 2)$.

Claim. 1: for every $k < l \in \mathbb{N}$: $t_{k,l} \in acl(v_{k,l})$.

Proof. By our assumptions $v_{1,2} = b_2, \quad t_{1,2} = c_2$ and $b_2 \in acl(c_2)$. From indiscernibility

$$tp(f_{i,j} \mid \ j \in \{l, k\}, \ 1 \leq i \leq 2) = tp(f_{i,j} \mid 1 \leq j \leq 2, \ 1 \leq i \leq 2),$$

thus from (1) we get $t_{k,l} \in acl(v_{k,l})$. □

Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ be the number of conjugates of $t_{1,2}$ over $v_{1,2}$ and fix $n > N + 2$. We look at

$$((v_{1,2}, t_{1,2}), (v_{2,3}, t_{2,3}), .., (v_{n,n+1}, t_{n,n+1})).$$

Claim. 2: For every permutation $\sigma \in S_n$, there is an automorphism τ_σ which sends: V$=((v_{1,2}, t_{1,2}), (v_{2,3}, t_{2,3}), .., (v_{n,n+1}, t_{n,n+1}))$ to $V_\sigma = ((v_{\sigma(1),\sigma(1)+1}, t_{\sigma(1),\sigma(1)+1}), .., (v_{\sigma(n),\sigma(n+1)}, t_{1,n}))$.

Proof. Let $p = tp(v_{1,2}, t_{1,2})$, and define

$$A = \{(\overline{s_1}, \overline{s_2}, ..., \overline{s_n}) \mid \overline{s_i} \vDash p, \ \{\overline{s_1}, .., \overline{s_n}\} - is\ independent\ set\}$$

by uniqueness of non-forking extensions of types, there is a complete type $q(\overline{x_1}, .., \overline{x_n})$ such that: $A = \{(\overline{s_1}, \overline{s_2}, ..., \overline{s_n}) \mid (\overline{s_1}, \overline{s_2}, ..., \overline{s_n}) \vDash q\}$. $V, V_\sigma \in A$, thus there exists an automorphism τ_σ such that $\tau_\sigma(V) = V_\sigma$. □

Claim. 3 Let $\sigma \in S_n$,

1. If there are $1 \leq M_1 < M_2 \leq n$ such that $\sigma(i) = i$ for every $M_1 \leq i \leq M_2$, then $\tau_\sigma(t_{M_1,M_2}){=}t_{M_1,M_2}$ and $\tau_\sigma(v_{M_1,M_2}){=}v_{M_1,M_2}$.
2. If there exists an $M < n$ such that for every $M \leq i \leq n$ we have: $\sigma(i) = i$, and $\tau_\sigma(t_{1,n+1}) = t_{1,n+1}$, then $\tau_\sigma(t_{1,M}) = t_{1,M}$.

Proof.

1. Observe that $\tau_\sigma(v_{M_1,M_2}){=}\tau_\sigma(\prod_{i=M_1}^{M_2-1} v_{i.i+1}){=}\prod_{i=M_1}^{M_2-1} \tau_\sigma(v_{i.i+1}){=}\prod_{i=M_1}^{M_2-1} v_{i.i+1}{=}v_{M_1,M_2}$. We prove that $\tau_\sigma(t_{M_1,M_2}) = t_{M_1,M_2}$ by induction on $M_2 - M_1$. The basis of the induction $(M_2 - M_1 = 1)$ follows by our assumption that $\sigma(M_1) = M_1$, for the induction step:

   $$\tau_\sigma(t_{M_1,M_2}) = \tau_\sigma(t_{M_1,M_2-1})\tau_\sigma(v_{M_2-1,M_2}) + \tau_\sigma(t_{M_2-1,M_2}) = t_{M_1,M_2-1}v_{M_2-1,M_2} + t_{M_2-1,M_2} = t_{M_1,M_2}$$

   (by induction hypothesis $\tau_\sigma(t_{M_1,M_2-1}) = t_{M_1,M_2-1}$).

2. We have $t_{1,n+1} = t_{1,M}v_{M,n+1} + t_{M,n+1}$, by the first part of the claim $\tau_\sigma(t_{M,n+1}) = t_{M,n+1}$ and $\tau_\sigma(v_{M_1,M_2}){=}v_{M_1,M_2}$ thus τ_σ fix $t_{1,M}$.

□

We are now ready to prove the main claim:

Claim. 4: For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$: $t_{k,k+2} = t_{k,k+1}v_{k+1,k+2} + t_{k+1,k+2} = t_{k+1,k+2}v_{k,k+1} + t_{k,k+1}$.

Proof. Let $\sigma_i = (i-1, i) \in S_n$, that is the permutation which replaces $i-1$ and i. By claim 1, $\tau_{\sigma_l}(t_{1,n+1}) \in acl(v_{1,n+1})$ and because $n > N$ there must exists $1 < l < m \leq n$ such that $\tau_{\sigma_l}(t_{1,n+1}){=}\tau_{\sigma_m}(t_{1,n+1})$. Hence, by Claim 3(2): $\tau_{\sigma_l}(t_{1,m+1}) = \tau_{\sigma_m}(t_{1,m+1})$ and using Claim 3 once again give us:

$$\tau_{\sigma_l}(t_{l-1,l+1}) - t_{l-1,l+1} = \tau_{\sigma_l}(t_{1,l+1}) - t_{1,l+1} = \frac{\tau_{\sigma_l}(t_{1,m+1}) - t_{1,m+1}}{v_{l+1,m+1}} = \frac{\tau_{\sigma_m}(t_{1,m+1}) - t_{1,m+1}}{v_{l+1,m+1}} = \frac{\tau_{\sigma_m}(t_{l+1,m+1}) - t_{l+1,m+1}}{v_{l+1,m+1}} = \frac{\tau_{\sigma_m}(t_{m-1,m+1}) - t_{m-1,m+1}}{v_{l+1,m+1}} = \alpha. \tag{4}$$

However, by (3) $\frac{\tau_{\sigma_m}(t_{l+1,m+1}) - t_{l+1,m+1}}{v_{l+1,m+1}} \in acl(v_{l+1,m+1})$ and $\tau_{\sigma_l}(t_{1,l+1}) - t_{1,l+1} \in acl(v_{1,l+1})$. We also know that $v_{1,l+1} \downarrow v_{l+1,m+1}$ (or else $\{f_{j,m+1}\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}} \in acl\{f_{i,1}, f_{i,l+1} \,|\, i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ in contradiction to the fact that F is an indiscernible array), therefore we can conclude that $\alpha \in acl(\emptyset)$.

On the one hand, by equation(4):

$$t_{l,l+1}v_{l-1,l} + t_{l-1,l} = \tau_{\sigma_l}(t_{l-1,l+1}) = \alpha + t_{l-1,l+1} = \alpha + t_{l-1,l}v_{l,l+1} + t_{l,l+1}.$$

On the other hand:

$$t_{m,m+1}v_{m-1,m} + t_{m-1,m} = \tau_{\sigma_m}(t_{m-1,m+1}) = \alpha v_{l+1,m+1} + t_{m-1,m+1} = \alpha \cdot v_{l+1,m+1} + t_{m-1,m}v_{m,m+1} + t_{m,m+1}.$$

However, $tp((t_{l-1,l}, v_{l,l-1}), (t_{l,l+1}, v_{l.l+1})) = tp((t_{m-1,m}, v_{m,m-1}), (t_{m,m+1}, v_{m,m+1}))$ thus necessarily:

$$\alpha \cdot v_{l+1,m+1} + t_{m-1,m}v_{m,m+1} + t_{m,m+1} = \alpha + t_{m-1,m}v_{m,m+1} + t_{m,m+1},$$

so $\alpha = 0$, and we get the desired result: $t_{l,l+1}v_{l-1,l} + t_{l-1,l} = t_{l-1,l}v_{l,l+1} + t_{l,l+1}$. □

Finally we can prove our lemma: By claim 4 $\frac{t_{k+1,k+2}}{(v_{k+1,k+2}-1)} = \frac{t_{k,k+1}}{(v_{k,k+1}-1)} = \alpha$. Therefore,

$$\alpha \in acl(v_{k+1,k+2}) \cap acl(v_{k,k+1}) \cap \mathbb{F} = acl(\emptyset) \cap \mathbb{F}$$

as desired.

□

Lemma 4.2. Let $(\mathbb{F}, \cdot, +)$ be a definable field.

1. *If* $F = (f_{i,j})$ is an indiscernible array, and there are elements $\{u_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$,$\{v_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$,$\{w_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{F}$, such that: $v_j \in acl(\emptyset)$, $\quad v_1 = 1$ and $f_{i,j} = u_i v_j + w_j$, then $v_j = 1$ for every $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$.
2. *If* $F = (f_{i,j,k})$ i*s a* 3 indiscernible array, and there are elements $\{u_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$,$\{v_{j,k}\}_{j,k\in\mathbb{N}}$,$\{w_{j,k}\}_{j,k\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{F}$ such that for every $i, j, k \in \mathbb{N}$ we have: $v_{1,k}{=}1$, $\quad w_{1,1}{=}0$, $\quad w_{j,1} \in$acl$(v_{j,1})$ and $f_{i,j,k}{=}u_i v_{j,k}{+}w_{j,k}$, then F has the field form.
3. *If* $F = (f_{i,j,k})$ is a 3 indiscernible array and there are elements $\{u_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$,$\{v_{j,k}\}_{j,k\in\mathbb{N}}$,$\{w_{j,k}\}_{j,k\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{F}$ such that for every $i, j, k \in \mathbb{N}$ we have: $v_{1,1}{=}1$, $\quad w_{1,1}{=}0$, $\quad w_{j,1} \in$acl$(v_{j,1})$, $\quad w_{1,k} \in$acl$(v_{1,k})$, $f_{i,j,k} = u_i v_{j,k} + w_{j,k}$, and $RM(\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{I}_3}) = 0$ where:

$$\mathcal{I}_3 = \{\{f_{1,1,1}, f_{2,1,1}\}, \{f_{1,2,1}, f_{2,2,1}\}, \{f_{1,1,2}, f_{2,1,2}\}, \{f_{1,2,2} f_{2,2,2}\}\}$$

   (see Definition *3.3*)*,* then F has the field form, or F has the twisted form.

Proof.

1. Let σ_3 be an automorphism such that $\sigma_3(f_{i,1}) = f_{i,1}$ and $\sigma_3(f_{i,2}) = f_{i,3}$ for every $1 \leq i \leq 2$, then: $v_2 = \sigma_3(v_2) = v_3$.

   For every $t \in \mathbb{N}$ let σ'_t be an automorphism such that: $\sigma'_t(f_{i,2}) = f_{i,1}$ and $\sigma'_t(f_{i,3}) = f_{i,t}$ for every $1 \leq i \leq 2$, then:

$$1 = \sigma'_t(1) = \sigma'_t(\frac{v_3}{v_2}) = \sigma'_t(\frac{f_{2,3} - f_{1,3}}{f_{2,2} - f_{1,2}}) = \frac{f_{2,t} - f_{1,t}}{f_{2,1} - f_{1,1}} = \frac{v_t}{v_1} = v_t.$$

2. By Lemma 4.1 there exist $\alpha \in acl(\emptyset) \cap \mathbb{F}$ such that $f_{i,j,1} = u_i v_{j,1} + \alpha(v_{j,1} - 1)$, thus by indiscerniblity: $\frac{f_{2,1,k}+\alpha}{f_{1,1,k}+\alpha} = \frac{f_{2,j,k}+\alpha}{f_{1,j,k}+\alpha} = \frac{u_2+\alpha}{u_1+\alpha}$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. By our assumption

$$f_{i,j,k} - f_{i,j,1} = f_{1,j,k} - f_{1,j,1} = 0$$

   for $j = 1$, and again by indiscerniblity, this is true for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $f_{1,j,k}$-$f_{1,1,1}{=}t^j_k$, notice that:

$$\tfrac{f_{2,1,1}+t^1_k+\alpha}{f_{1,1,1}+t^1_k+\alpha}{=}\tfrac{f_{2,1,k}+\alpha}{f_{1,1,k}+\alpha}{=}\tfrac{f_{2,j,k}+\alpha}{f_{1,j,k}+\alpha}{=}\tfrac{f_{2,j,1}+\alpha+t^j_k}{f_{1,j,1}+\alpha+t^j_k}.$$

   However, $f_{i,j,1} + \alpha = (f_{i,1,1} + \alpha) \cdot v_{j,1}$, thus:

$$\frac{f_{2,1,1} + t^1_k + \alpha}{f_{1,1,1} + t^1_k + \alpha} = \frac{(f_{2,1,1} + \alpha) \cdot v_{j,1} + t^j_k}{(f_{1,1,1} + \alpha) \cdot v_{j,1} + t^j_k},$$

   which implies: $t^j_k = v_{j,1} t^1_k$.

   Let $f'_{i,j,k} = f_{i,j,k} + \alpha$, $u'_i = u_i + \alpha$, $v'_j = v_{j,1}$, $w'_k = w_{1,k} = t^1_k$, then: $f'_{i,j,k} \in acl(f_{i,j,k})$ and we have:

$$f'_{i,j,k} = f_{i,j,k} + \alpha = f_{i,j,1} + t^j_k + \alpha = f_{i,j,1} + t^1_k v_{j,1} + \alpha = (u_i + \alpha + t^1_k) v_{j,1} = (u'_i + w'_k) \cdot v'_j.$$

3. By Lemma 4.1 there are $\alpha, \beta \in acl(\emptyset) \cap \mathbb{F}$ such that $f_{i,j,1} = u_i v_{j,1} + \alpha(v_{j,1} - 1)$ and $f_{i,1,k} = u_i v_{j,1} + \beta(v_{1,k} - 1)$ (†).

   If $\alpha = \beta$, then:

   $$\tfrac{f_{2,2,2}+\alpha}{f_{1,2,2}+\alpha} = \tfrac{f_{2,1,1}+\alpha}{f_{1,1,1}+\alpha} = \tfrac{f_{2,1,2}+\alpha}{f_{1,1,2}+\alpha} = \tfrac{f_{2,2,1}+\alpha}{f_{1,2,1}+\alpha} = \tfrac{u_2+\alpha}{u_1+\alpha}$$

   and of course $RM(\frac{f_{2,1,1}+\alpha}{f_{1,1,1}+\alpha}) = 1$, thus $RM(\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{I}_3}) = 1$, in contradiction to our assumption.

   Assume $\alpha \neq \beta$: Let $\widetilde{u_i^j} = f_{i,j,1},\ v_k^j = \frac{v_{j,k}}{v_{j,1}}$ and $\widetilde{w_k^j} = w_{j,k} - w_{j,1} \cdot \widetilde{v_k^j}$, then $f_{i,j,k} = \widetilde{u_i^j} \cdot \widetilde{v_k^j} + \widetilde{w_k^j}$.
   Observe that for $j = 1$ we have: $\widetilde{w_k^1} = w_{1,k} = \beta(v_{1,k}\text{-}1) = \beta(\widetilde{v_k^1}\text{-}1)$.

   Let σ_j be an automorphism which takes $(f_{i,1,l} \,|\, 1 \leq i \leq 2, \quad l \in \{1, k\})$ to $(f_{i,j,l} \,|\, 1 \leq i \leq 2, \quad l \in \{1, k\})$, then it satisfies: $\widetilde{w_k^j} = \sigma_j(\widetilde{w_k^1}) = \beta(\widetilde{v_k^j} - 1)$. In conclusion we have: $(1) f_{i,j,k} = f_{i,j,1}\frac{v_{j,k}}{v_{j,1}} + \frac{v_{j,k}}{v_{j,1}}\beta - \beta$, and in the same way we get: $(2) f_{i,j,k} = f_{i,1,k}\frac{v_{j,k}}{v_{1,k}} + \frac{v_{j,k}}{v_{1,k}}\alpha - \alpha$.

   We can rewrite (1) as follows:

   $$f_{1,j,k} = f_{1,j,1}\frac{v_{j,k}}{v_{j,1}} + \frac{v_{j,k}}{v_{j,1}}\beta - \beta = (f_{1,1,1}v_{j,1} + v_{j,1}\alpha - \alpha)\frac{v_{j,k}}{v_{j,1}} + \frac{v_{j,k}}{v_{j,1}}\beta - \beta.$$

   On the other hand, by (2) we get:

   $$f_{1,j,k} = f_{1,1,k}\frac{v_{j,k}}{v_{1,k}} + \frac{v_{j,k}}{v_{1,k}}\alpha - \alpha = (f_{1,1,1}v_{1,k} + v_{1,k}\beta - \beta)\frac{v_{j,k}}{v_{1,k}} + \frac{v_{j,k}}{v_{1,k}}\alpha - \alpha,$$

   thus: $(\alpha - \beta)(v_{j,k} - \frac{v_{j,k}}{v_{j,1}} - \frac{v_{j,k}}{v_{1,k}} + 1) = 0$. Therefore, by our assumption:

   $$0 = \frac{v_{j,k}}{v_{j,1}} \cdot v_{j,1} - \frac{v_{j,k}}{v_{j,1}} - \frac{v_{j,k}}{v_{1,k}} + 1 = \frac{v_{j,k}}{v_{j,1}} \cdot v_{j,1} - \frac{v_{j,k}}{v_{j,1}} - \frac{\left(\frac{v_{j.k}}{v_{j,1}}\right)}{v_{1,k}}v_{j,1} + 1,$$

   which implies $\frac{v_{j,k}}{v_{j,1}} = \frac{v_{1,k}}{v_{1,k} - v_{1,k}v_{j,1} + v_{j,1}}$ and

   $$f_{i,j,k} = (f_{i,1,1}v_{j,1} + v_{j,1}\alpha - \alpha)\frac{v_{1,k}}{v_{1,k} - v_{1,k}v_{j,1} + v_{j,1}} + \frac{v_{1,k}}{v_{1,k} - v_{1,k}v_{j,1} + v_{j,1}}\beta - \beta.$$

   Let: $f'_{i,j,k} = \frac{f_{i,j,k}+\alpha}{\beta-\alpha},\ w'_k = v_{1,k},\ v'_j = v_{j,1},\ u'_i = f'_{i,1,1}$, then: $acl(f'_{i,j,k}) = acl(f_{i,j,k})$ and

   $$\begin{aligned} f'_{i,j,k} \quad &= \frac{(f_{i,1,1} + \alpha)v'_j - \alpha + \beta)\frac{w'_k}{w'_k - w'_k v'_j + v'_j} + \alpha - \beta}{\beta - \alpha} = (\frac{f_{i,1,1} + \alpha}{\beta - \alpha})v'_j + 1)\frac{w'_k}{w'_k - w'_k v'_j + v'_j} - 1 \\ &= (u'_i v'_j + 1)\frac{w'_k}{w'_k - w'_k v'_j + v'_j} - 1 \end{aligned}$$

   Let $v''_j = \frac{1}{v'_j}, \quad w''_k = \frac{1}{w'_k} - 1$ and $t_{i,j,k} = (u'_i v'_j + 1)\frac{w'_k}{w'_k - w'_k v'_j + v'_j}$,then $t_{i,j,k} = \frac{u'_i + v''_j}{v''_j + w''_k}$ and $acl(t_{i,j,k}) = acl(f_{i,j,k})$. Thus F has the twisted form.

$\square$

5 Main Theorem

In the previous section we studied indiscernible arrays that were induced by fields/group, the following lemma will be helpful in retrieving indiscernible arrays of this form.

Lemma 5.1. *Let* $F = (f_{i,j,k})$ *be a 3 indiscernible array,* $\{a_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{U}$, $\{\overline{b_{j,k}}\}_{j,k\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{U}^m$ *and* $h : \mathcal{U}^{m+1} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ *a definable function.*

1. *If there is a formula* $\phi(x, y)$ *such that for every* $i, j, k \in \mathbb{N}$*:* $h(a_i, \overline{b}_{j,k}) \vDash \phi(x, f_{i,j,k})$ *and* $|\{a \vDash \phi(x, f_{i,j,k}) \mid a \in \mathcal{U}\}| < \infty$*, then there are* $\{a'_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{U}$, $\{\overline{b'_{j,k}}\}_{j,k\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{U}^m$ *and a 3 indiscernible array* $F' = (f'_{i,j,k})$ *such that* $f'_{i,j,k} = h(a'_i, \overline{b'_{j,k}})$ *and* F' *is algebraically equivalent to* F*.*

2. *Suppose there is a formula* $\phi(x, y)$ *, such that for every* $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$*:* $h(a_i,\overline{b}_{j,j})\vDash \phi(x,f_{i,j,j})$*,* $|\{a \vDash \phi(x, f_{i,j,j}) \mid a \in \mathcal{U}\}| < \infty$ *and* $h(a_i, \overline{b_{1,1}}) = a_i$*, then there are* $\{a'_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{U}$*,* $\{\overline{b'_{j,k}}\}_{j,k\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{U}^m$ *and a 3 indiscernible array* $F' = (f'_{i,j,k})$ *such that:* $f'_{i,j,k} = h(a'_i, \overline{b'_{j,k}})$ *and* F' *is algebraically equivalent to* F*.*

Proof.

1. Let $h(a_i, \overline{b_{j,k}}) = t_{i,j,k}$. We use the infinite Ramsey theorem: Fix $N \in \mathbb{N}$, for every $r_1, .., r_N \in \mathbb{N}$ let $\sigma_{r_1,..,r_N}$ be an automorphism such that: $(\sigma(f_{i,j,r_k}) \mid 1 \le i, k, j \le N) = (f_{i,j,k} \mid 1 \le i, j, k \le N)$. By the infinite Ramsey theorem there is an infinite subset $I \subset \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $r_1, .., r_N, t_1, .., t_N \in I$ we have: $tp(t'_{i,j,r_k} \mid 1 \le i, k, j \le N) = tp(t'_{i,j,t_k} \mid 1 \le i, j, k \le N)$. By compactness we can find $\{a'_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{U}$, $\{\overline{b'_{j,k}}\}_{j,k\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{U}^m$ and an array $F' = (t'_{i,j,k})$ such that: $t'_{i,j,k} = h(a'_i, \overline{b'_{j,k}}) \in acl(f_{i,j,k})$ and for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $r_1, .., r_n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have:

$$tp(t'_{i,j,r_k} \mid 1 \le i, k, j \le n) = tp(t'_{i,j,k} \mid 1 \le i, j, k \le n)(\dagger).$$

   If we repeat this construction, this time with respect to $(t'_{i,j,k})_{i,j,k\in\mathbb{N}}$, we can find $\{a''_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{U}$ and $\{\overline{b''_{j,k}}\}_{j,k\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{U}^m$ such that $t'_{i,j,k} = h(a'_i, \overline{b'_{j,k}}) \in acl(f_{i,j,k})$ satisfies (†), and also for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $r_1, .., r_n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have: $tp(t''_{i,r_j,k} \mid 1 \le i, j, k \le n) = tp(t''_{i,j,k} \mid 1 \le i, j, k \le n)$.

   Repeating this construction for the last time with respect to $(t''_{i,j,k})$, we can find: $\{a^{(3)}\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{U}$, $\{\overline{b^{(3)}{}_{j,k}}\}_{j,k\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{U}^m$ and an array $F'' = (f'_{i,j,k})$ (where $f'_{i,j,k} = h(a^{(3)}_i, \overline{b^{(3)}_{j,k}})$) which satisfies (†) and also for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and for every $r_1, .., r_n \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$tp(f'_{i,r_j,k} \mid 1 \le i, j, k \le n) = tp(f'_{i,j,k} \mid 1 \le i, j, k \le n)$$
$$tp(f'_{r_i,j,k} \mid 1 \le i, j, k \le n) = tp(f'_{i,j,k} \mid 1 \le i, j, k \le n)$$

   Thus for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and for every $r_1, .., r_n, t_1, .., t_n, w_1, .., w_n \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$tp(f'_{r_i,t_j,w_k} \mid 1 \le i, j, k \le n) = tp(f'_{i,t_j,w_k} \mid 1 \le i, j, k \le n) =$$
$$tp(f'_{i,j,w_k} \mid 1 \le i, j, k \le n) = tp(f'_{i,j,k} \mid 1 \le i, j, k \le n)$$

   therefore, F' is a 3 indiscernible array.

2. Let $M = |\{a \vDash \phi(x, f_{i,j,k}) \,|\, a \in \mathcal{U}\}|$. Fix $N \in \mathbb{N}$, by indecerniblity for every $1 \leq i \leq N,\ 1 \leq j \leq (N+1) \cdot M^N$ and $k > (N+1) \cdot M^N$ there is an automorphism $\sigma_{j,k}$ such that: $\sigma_{j,k}(f_{i,1,1}) = f_{i,1,1}$ and $\sigma_{j,k}(f_{i,j,j}) = f_{i,j,k}$. By our assumptions for every $1 \leq i \leq N$ and $1 \leq j \leq M^N + 1$: $|\{\sigma_{j,k}(a_i) \,|k > M^N + 1\}| < \infty$, thus there is an infinite subset $I_1 \subset \mathbb{N} \backslash \{1,..,(\mathrm{N}+1) \cdot M^N\}$ such that for every $1 \leq i \leq N$ and for every $r, l \in I_1$: $\sigma_{2,r}(a_i) = \sigma_{2,l}(a_i)$.

   We resume and build I_j constructively such that $I_j \subset I_{j-1}$ is an infinite subset and $\sigma_{j,r}(a_i) = \sigma_{j,l}(a_i)$ for every $1 \leq i \leq N$ and every $r, l \in I_j$. By the pigeonhole principle there is a set $J \subset \{1, .., (N+1) \cdot M^N\}$ such that $|J| \geq N$ and for every $1 \leq i \leq N$, $j, j' \in J$ and $r, r' \in I_{M^n+1} : \sigma_{j,r}(a_i) = \sigma_{j',r'}(a_i) = a'_i$. In particular $h(a'_i, \sigma_{j,k}(\overline{b_{j,j}})) \in acl(f_{i,j,k})$ for every $1 \leq i \leq N, \quad j \in J, \quad k \in I_{(N+1) \cdot M^N}$. By compactness we can find $\{a''_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}, \{\overline{b'_{j,k}}\} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that: $h(a''_i \overline{b'_{j,k}})) \in acl(f_{i,j,k})$. We may now use the first part of this lemma in order to get the desired 3 indiscernible array.

□

The next lemma takes care of the group form case:

Lemma 5.2. *Let $F = (f_{i,j,k})$ be a 3 indiscernible array with $\alpha(m, n, p) = m + n + p - 2$ such that for every frame of the unit cube $\mathcal{I}$ there is an element $g \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $RM(g) = 1$ and $g \in \bigcap_{l \in \mathcal{I}} acl(l)$. Then F has the group form.*

Proof. Conssider the indiscernible array $F' = (f_{i,j,j} \,|\, i, j \in \mathbb{N})$. $RM(f_{1,1,1}, f_{1,2,2}, f_{2,1,1}, f_{2,2,2}) = 3$, thus by 3.1 (2): $\alpha_{F'}(m, n) = m + n - 1$. By fact 2.2(1) there is a definable one dimensional group $(G, \cdot)$ and elements $\{b_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}, \{a_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subset G$ such that $acl(f_{i,j,j}) = acl(a_i \cdot b_j)$ for every $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$. By Lemma 5.1 there exist an indiscernible array $F' = (f'_{i,j,k})$ which is algebraically equivalent to F such that $f'_{i.j.k} = a'_i \cdot b'_{j,k}$, where $\{a'_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}, \{b'_{j,k}\}_{j,k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset G$.
For every $i, j, k, j, n \in \mathbb{N}$: $\frac{f'_{i,j',k}}{f'_{i,j,k}} = \frac{b'_{l,k}}{b'_{j,k}} = \frac{f'_{i+1,j',k}}{f'_{i+1,j,k}}$, and by Remark 3.4 $acl(\frac{b'_{j',k}}{b'_{j,k}}) = acl(\frac{b'_{j',k'}}{b'_{j,k'}})$ for every $k, k' \in \mathbb{N}$, so for every $j', j \in \mathbb{N}$ there must exists $k, k' \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\frac{b'_{l,k}}{b'_{j,k}} = \frac{b'_{l,k'}}{b'_{j,k'}}$, thus by indiscerniblity $\frac{b'_{j',k}}{b'_{j,k}}$ does not depend on k. Fixing j instead of k we get: $\frac{f'_{i,j,k'}}{f'_{i,j,k}} = \frac{b'_{j,k'}}{b'_{j,k}} = \frac{f'_{i+1,j,k'}}{f'_{i+1,j,k}}$, therefore by the same considerations: $\frac{b'_{j,k'}}{b'_{j,k}}$ does not depend on j. Let $a''_i = a'_i \cdot b_{1,1}, \quad b''_j = \frac{b'_{j,1}}{b'_{1,1}}$ and $c''_k = \frac{b'_{1,k}}{b'_{1,1}}$, then for every $i, j, k \geq 2$:

$$f'_{i,j,k} = a'_i b'_{j,k} = a'_i \cdot b_{1,1}(\frac{b'_{j,k}}{b'_{j,1}} \cdot \frac{b_{j,1}}{b_{1.1}}) = a''_i \cdot b''_j \cdot c''_k,$$

so F has the group form. □

The following lemma gives us the definable field which generate the field/twisted form. We use the notations of Definition 3.3:

Lemma 5.3. *Let $F = (f_{i,j,k})$ be a 3 indiscernible array with $\alpha(m, n, p) = m + n + p - 2$, and let $F' = (f_{i,j,j})_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}}$. If $RM(\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{I}_3}) = 0$ where $\mathcal{I}_3 = \{\{f_{1,1,1}, f_{2,1,1}\}, \{f_{1,2,1}, f_{2,2,1}\}, \{f_{1,1,2}, f_{2,1,2}\}, \{f_{1,2,2} f_{2,2,2}\}\}$, then $\alpha_{F'}(m, n) = m + 2n - 2$.*

Proof. Let $A_{m,n} = \{f_{i,j,k} \,|\, 1 \le i \le m, \quad 1 \le j,k \le n\}$ be the $m \times n \times n$ cube. We first show that $acl(A_{2,n}) \subset acl(f_{i,j,j} \,|\, 1 \le j \le n, \quad 1 \le i \le 2)$ (†) by induction.

For $n = 2$: if $acl(A_{2,2}) \not\subseteq acl(f_{1,1,1}, f_{1,2,2}, f_{2,1,1}, f_{2,2,2})$, then $RM(f_{1,1,1}, f_{1,2,2}, f_{2,1,1}, f_{2,2,2}) < 4$ so it must be equal to 3. Thus by Lemma 3.1(2) and Fact 2.2 there is a definable group G and elements $\{a_i\}$,$\{b_j\}$⊂G such that $acl(f_{i,j,j}) = acl(a_i{\cdot}b_j)$. In particular $g = \frac{a_2}{a_1} \in acl(f_{1,1,1}, f_{2,1,1}) \cap acl(f_{1,2,2}f_{2,2,2})$. By indiscerniblity $g \in acl(f_{1,3,2}, f_{2,3,2}) \cap acl(f_{1,2,3}, f_{2,2,2}) \cap acl(f_{1,3,3}, f_{2,3,3})$. By using indiscerniblity one more time, we may retrieve an automorphism σ which sends the cube: $(f_{i,j,k} \,|\, 1 \le i \le 2, \quad 2 \le j,k \le 3)$ to the unit cube $(f_{i,j,k} \,|\, 1 \le i,j,k \le 2)$, thus $\sigma(g) \in \bigcap_{l \in \mathcal{I}_3} acl(l)$, in contradiction to the assumption that $Rm(\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{I}_3}) = 0$.

If $n > 2$, then by induction hypothesis: $acl(A_{2,n-1}) \subset acl(f_{i,j,j} \,|\, 1 \le j \le n-1, \quad 1 \le i \le 2)$. Notice that: $tp(f_{i,j,k} \,|\, 1 \le i,j,k \le 2) = tp(f_{i,j,k} \,|\, 1 \le i \le 2, \quad j,k \in \{l,n\})$ (for every $1 \le l \le n-1$), since the following holds as well

$$\{f_{i,j,k} \,|\, 1 \le i \le 2 \quad j,k \in \{l,n\}\} \subset acl(A_{2,n-1}) \cup acl(f_{1,n,n}, f_{2,n,n}) \subset \\ acl(\{f_{i,j,j} \,|\, 1 \le j \le n \quad 1 \le i \le 2\})$$

We can use indiscerniblity to extend (†) to every $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and get:

$$acl(A_{m,n}) \subset acl(f_{i,j,j} \,|\, 1 \le j \le n, \quad 1 \le i \le m).$$

Thus $\alpha_{F'}$(m,n)=α_F(m,n,n)=m+2n-2. □

Remark 5.4. The same proof (just changing indices) will also work for the frames $\mathcal{I}_1$ and $\mathcal{I}_2$.

We are now ready to prove our Main Theorem.

Theorem 5.5. *Let $F = (f_{i,j,k})$ be a 3 indiscernible array and suppose that $\alpha_F(m,n,k) = m+n+k-2$, then there are exactly three possibilities:*

1. *F has the group form.*
2. *F has the field form.*
3. *F has the twisted form.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.5 every form excludes the other ones, so these are strictly distinct cases. In order to prove that F must have one of the above forms we split to cases according to the dividing line:
If for every frame of the unit cube $\mathcal{I}$ $Rm(\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{I}}) = 1$, then F has the group form by Lemma 5.2. In the other case, there is a frame $\mathcal{I}$ such that $Rm(\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{I}}) = 0$ (†) .

Without loss of generality we may assume $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}_3 = \{\{f_{1,1,1}, f_{2,1,1}\}, \{f_{1,2,1}, f_{2,2,1}\}, \{f_{1,1,2}, f_{2,1,2}\}, \{f_{1,2,2}f_{2,2,2}\}\}$, by Lemma 5.3 and Fact 2.2 there is a definable field $\mathbb{F}$ and elements $\{u_i\}$,$\{v_j\}$,$\{w_k\}$$\subset \mathbb{F}$ such that:
$acl(f_{i,j,j}) = acl(u_i v_j + w_j)$, so we may use Lemma 5.1 in order to get $\{u'_i\}$, $\{v'_{j,k}\}$, $\{w'_{j,k}\} \subset \mathbb{F}$ such that:
$F' = (f'_{i,j,k})$ where $f'_{i,j,k} = u'_i v'_{j,k} + w'_{j,k}$, is a 3 indiscernible array which is algebraically equivalent to F, we may assume $v'_{1,1} = 1$ and $w'_{1,1} = 0$. Let $A_1 = (f_{i,1,k} \,|\, 1 \le i,k \le 2)$ and A_2=($f_{i,1,k} \,|\,$ 3≤i≤4, 1≤k≤2).
Observe that $(w'_{1,2}, v'_{1,2}) \in acl(A_1) \cap acl(A_2)$, hence:

$$RM(A_1A_2) - RM(w'_{1,2}, v'_{1,2}) = RM(A_1A_2/(w'_{1,2}, v'_{1,2})) \le \\ RM(A_1/(w'_{1,2}, v'_{1,2})) + RM(A_2/(w'_{1,2}, v'_{1,2})) = 2RM(A_1) - 2RM((w'_{1,2}, v'_{1,2})),$$

and $RM(w'_{1,2}, v'_{1,2}) \leq 6 - 5 = 1$.
On the other hand, $RM(A_1) = 3 > 2$, thus $RM(w'_{1,2}, v'_{1,2}) \geq 1$, so it must be equal to 1. In the same way we get $RM(w'_{2,1}, v'_{2,1}) = 1$. We split into cases:

1. Assume that $w'_{1,2} \notin acl(v'_{1,2})$: then $RM(v'_{1,2}) = RM(\frac{v'_{1,2}}{v'_{1,1}}) = 0$ and by indiscerniblity for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$: $RM(\frac{v'_{j,2}}{v'_{j,1}}) = 0$. If also $RM(v'_{2,1}) = 0$, then $RM(v'_{2,2}) = RM(\frac{v'_{2,2}}{v_{2,1}} \cdot v'_{2,1}) = 0$, hence
$$acl(u_2 - u_1) = acl(v'_{2,2}(u_2 - u_1)) \in acl(f_{1,1,1}, f_{2,1,1}) \cap acl(f_{1,2,2}f_{2,2,2})$$
in contradiction to assumption (†). Thus: $RM(v'_{j,1}) = 1$ and $w'_{j,1} \in acl(v'_{j,1})$, and by Lemma 4.2 (1)+(2) F has the field form.
2. Assume that $w'_{1,2} \in acl(v'_{1,2})$ (in particular $RM(v'_{1,2}) = 1$):
If $w'_{2,1} \notin acl(v'_{2.1})$ then again by Lemma 4.2(1)+(2) F has the field form.
If $w'_{2,1} \in acl(v'_{2,1})$ then by assumption (†) and Lemma 4.2 (3), F has the twisted form.

□

6 Application

In this section we will see an application to Theorem 2.5.

Let k ba an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero and $k \subset K$ be a universal domain of k. Every variety over k will be identified with a definable subset in K^m for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and each morphism between varieties will be identified with a definable function between the corresponding definable sets (for more information about the model theoretic framework see [5], for the precise identification see Remark 3.10 there).

Definition 6.1. Let V_1, V_2, V_3, U be irreducible curves over k and let $P : V_1 \times V_2 \times V_3 \to U$ be a rational map.

1. P is non-degenerate if for every generic independent elements $v_i \in V_i$, the set: $\{v_1, v_2, v_3, P(v_1, v_2, v_3)\}$ is 3 independent.
2. P has the group form, if there exists a one dimensional algebraic group $(G, *)$, an affine variety $\overline{U}$ and rational maps: $r_i : V_i \to G$, $\overline{P} : V_1 \times V_2 \times V_3 \to \overline{U}$, $q : \overline{U} \to G$, and $\pi : \overline{U} \to U$ such that:
$$\pi \circ \overline{P}(x, y, z) = P(x, y, z) \text{ and } q \circ \overline{P}(x, y, z) = r_1(x) * r_2(y) * r_3(z).$$
3. P has the field form if there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$, an affine variety $\overline{U}$ and rational maps:
$r_i : V_i \to K$, $\overline{P} : V_1 \times V_2 \times V_3 \to \overline{U}$, $q : \overline{U} \to K$, and $\pi : \overline{U} \to U$ such that:
$$\pi \circ \overline{P}(x, y, z) = P(x, y, z) \text{ and } q \circ \overline{P}(x_1, x_2, x_3) = r_i(x_i) \cdot (r_j(x_j) + r_l(x_l))^n,$$
where $i{\neq}j{\neq}l \in \{1, 2, 3\}$.

4. P has the twisted form if there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$, an affine variety $\overline{U}$ and rational maps: $r_i : V_i \to K$, $\overline{P} : V_1 \times V_2 \times V_3 \to \overline{U}$, $q : \overline{U} \to K$, and $\pi : \overline{U} \to U$ such that:

$$\pi \circ \overline{P}(x, y, z) = P(x, y, z) \text{ and } q \circ \overline{P}(x, y, z) = \frac{r_1(x) + r_2(y)}{r_2(y) + r_3(z)}.$$

Our aim, is to prove the following theorem:

Theorem 6.2. *Let V_1, V_2, V_3, U be irreducible curves, and let $P : V_1 \times V_2 \times V_3 \to U$ be a non-degenerate rational map such that:*

$$T = \{(P(u_i, v_j, w_k) \,|\, (i, j, k) \in \{0, 1\}^3) \,|\, u_1, u_2 \in V_1,\ v_1, v_2 \in V_2,\ w_1, w_2 \in V_3\} \subset U^8$$

has Zariski dimension 4, then P has either the group form, the field form or the twisted form.

Definition 6.3. Let V_1, V_2, V_3, U be irreducible curves and let $P : V_1 \times V_2 \times V_3 \to U$ be a rational map, we say that a 3 indiscernible array $F = (f_{i,j,k})$ is induced by P, if there exist an independent set: $\{u_i, v_j, w_k \,|\, u_i \in V_1\ v_j \in V_2\ w_k \in V_3\ i, j, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ such that $f_{i,j,k} = P(u_i, v_j, w_k)$.

Lemma 6.4. *Let V_1, V_2, V_3, U be irreducible curves, $S : V_1 \times V_2 \times V_3 \to U$ be a non-degenerate rational map and $F = (f_{i,j,k})$ be a 3 indicernible array induced by S. If*

$$T = \{(S(u_i, v_j, w_k) \,|\, (i, j, k) \in \{0, 1\}^3) \,|\, u_1, u_2 \in V_1,\ v_1, v_2 \in V_2,\ w_1, w_2 \in V_3\} \subset U^8$$

has Zariski dimension 4, then $\alpha_F(m, n, p) = m + n + p - 2$.

Proof. Let $\{u_i, v_j, w_k \,|\, u_i \in V_1,\ v_j \in V_2,\ w_k \in V_3,\ i, j, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be an independent set such that $f_{i,j,k}$=S(u_i,v_j,w_k). By our assumption

$$RM(f_{1,j,k} \,|\, 1 \le j, k \le 2) = RM(f_{j,1,k} \,|\, 1 \le j, k \le 2) = RM(f_{j,k,1} \,|\, 1 \le j, k \le 2) = 3,$$

thus by Lemma 3.1 $\alpha_F(m, n, p) = m + n + p - 2$. □

Lemma 6.5. *Let V_1, V_2, V_3, U be irreducible curves, $P : V_1 \times V_2 \times V_3 \to U$ a non-degenerate rational map and $a_i \in V_i$ (where $1 \le i \le 3$) generic independent elements. Suppose there exists a definable field $\mathbb{F}$, and independent generic elements $u_1, u_2, u_3 \in \mathbb{F}$, such that: $acl(a_i) = acl(u_i)$ for every $1 \le i \le 3$ and $acl(P(a_1, a_2, a_3)) = acl(\frac{u_3+u_2}{u_2+u_1})$ or $acl(P(a_1, a_2, a_3)) = acl(u_1(u_2 + u_3))$, then: $u_3 \in dcl(a_3)$.*

Proof.
Case 1: If $acl(P(a_1, a_2, a_3)) = acl(u_1(u_2+u_3))$, let u_3' be a conjugate of u_3 over a_3. Because $u_3 \downarrow u_2, u_1$, then by uniqueness of the non forking extension:

$$tp((u_3, a_3)/acl(u_1, u_2)) = tp((u_3', a_3)/acl(u_1, u_2)).$$

Hence there is an automorphism σ which fixes $(a_1, a_2, a_3, u_2, u_1)$ and sends u_3 to u_3'. Thus

$$acl(u_1(u_2 + u_3)) = acl(u_1(u_2 + u_3')) = acl(P(a_1, a_2, a_3)),$$

and if we define $t = u_1(u_2+u_3)$, then $u_1 \cdot (u_3' - u_3) \in acl(t)$. However, $t \downarrow u_1, u_3$ thus $u_1 \cdot (u_3' - u_3) \in acl(\emptyset)$, but $(u_3' - u_3) \in acl(u_1) \cap acl(u_3) = acl(\emptyset)$, so we must have $u_3' = u_3$.

Case 2: If $acl(P(a_1,a_2,a_3)) = acl(\frac{u_1+u_2}{u_2+u_3})$ then again, let u_3' be a conjugate of u_1 over a_1. Notice that: $acl(\frac{u_3+u_2}{u_2+u_1}) = acl(\frac{u_3'+u_2}{u_2+u_1})$. Let $t = \frac{u_3+u_2}{u_2+u_1}$ and $s = \frac{1}{u_2+u_1}$, then $acl(t) = acl(t + s(u_3 - u_3'))$, therefore, as in Case 1 we must have: $u_3 = u_3'$.

$\square$

We are working in an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero, so if there are two irreducible varieties V_1, V_2 and generic elements $g \in V_1,\ g' \in V_2$ such that $g \in dcl(g')$, then there is a rational function $h : V_1 \to V_2$ such that $h(g) = g'$ (see [6] 4.9). We also use the fact that every definable field $\mathbb{F}$ in K is definably isomorphic to K (see [5] 4.13).

Theorem 6.6. *Let V_1, V_2, V_3, U be irreducible curves, $P : V_1 \times V_2 \times V_3 \to U$ a non-degenerate rational map, and let $a_i \in V_i$ (where $1 \le i \le 3$) be generic independent elements.*

1. *If there exist generic independent elements $\{u_1, u_2, u_3\} \subset K$ such that $acl(a_i) = acl(u_i)$ and $acl(P(a_1,a_2,a_3)) = acl(\frac{u_1+u_2}{u_2+u_3})$, then P has the field form.*
2. *If there exist generic independent elements $\{u_1, u_2, u_3\} \subset K$ such that $acl(a_i) = acl(u_i)$ and $acl(P(a_1,a_2,a_3)) = acl(u_1(u_2+u_3))$, then P has the twisted form.*

Proof.

1. Observe that

$$acl(P(a_1,a_2,a_3)) = acl(\frac{u_3+u_2}{u_2+u_1}) = acl(\frac{u_1+u_2}{u_2+u_3}) = acl(\frac{1}{\frac{u_1+u_2}{u_2+u_3} - 1} = \frac{u_2+u_3}{u_1-u_3}),$$

thus by Lemma 6.5 for every $1 \le i \le 3$: $acl(a_i) = acl(u_i)$, so there are rational maps $r_i : V_i \to K$ such that $r_i(a_i) = u_i$. Choose $t \in k(P(a_1,a_2,a_3))^{alg}$ such that $k(a_1,a_2,a_3) \cap k(t)^{acl} = k(t)$. Let $\overline{U}$ be an affine variety such that $k(t) = k(\overline{U})$.
On the one hand: $\frac{u_3+u_2}{u_2+u_1} \in dcl(t)$, on the other hand: $P(a_1,a_2,a_3) \in dcl(t)$ and $t \in dcl(a_1,a_2,a_3)$. Thus there exists rational maps: $\overline{P} : V_1 \times V_2 \times V_3 \to \overline{U}$, $q : \overline{U} \to K$ and $\pi : \overline{U} \to U$ such that: $\pi \circ \overline{P}(x,y,z) = P(x,y,z)$ and $q \circ \overline{P}(x,y,z) = \frac{r_1(x)+r_2(y)}{r_2(y)+r_3(z)}$.

2. By lemma 6.5 there are rational maps $r_i : V_i \to K$ such that $r_i(a_i) = u_i$ where $2 \le i \le 3$.
Let u_1' be a conjugate of u_1 over a_1, then, as in the previous lemma, there is an automorphism σ which fixes a_1, a_2, a_3, u_2, u_3 and sends u_1 to u_1'. So $acl(u_1(u_2+u_3) = acl(u_1'(u_2+u_3))$. If we take $t = u_1(u_2+u_3)$ then $\sigma(t) = t \cdot \frac{u_1'}{u_1}$ and $acl(t \cdot \frac{u_1'}{u_1}) = acl(t)$. Hence, $\frac{u_1'}{u_1} \in acl(t) \cap acl(u_1) = acl(\emptyset)$ and $\sigma^i(t) = t \cdot (\frac{u_1'}{u_1})^n \in acl(a_1,a_2,a_3)$, so there must be $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(\frac{u_1'}{u_1})^n = 1$.
Fix $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(\frac{u'}{u''})^N = 1$ for every two conjugates u', u'' of u_1 over a_1. $u_1^N \in dcl(a_1)$ so there is a rational map $r_1 : V_1 \to \mathbb{F}$ such that $r_1(a_1) = u_1^N$. In conclusion:

$$acl(P(a_1,a_2,a_3)) = acl(r_1(a_1) \cdot (r_2(a_2) + r_3(a_3))^N)$$

and as in Part 1 of this theorem we can find an affine variety $\overline{U}$, and rational maps $\overline{P}, \pi, q$ such that: $\pi \circ \overline{P}(x,y,z) = P(x,y,z)$ and $q \circ \overline{P}(x,y,z) = r_1(x) \cdot (r_2(y) + r_3(z))^N$.

$\square$

Theorem 6.7. *Let V_1, V_2, V_3, U be irreducible curves, $P : V_1 \times V_2 \times V_3 \to U$ a non-degenerate rational map, $a_i \in V_i$ (where $1 \leq i \leq 3$) be generic independent elements, and $(G, *)$ be a one dimensional algebraic group. If there exist generic independent elements $\{u_1, u_2, u_3\} \subset G$ such that $acl(a_i) = acl(u_i)$ and $acl(P(a_1, a_2, a_3)) = acl(u_1 * u_2 * u_3)$ then P has the group form.*

Proof. As in the proof of Theorem 6.6 we can find $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $u_i^N \in dcl(a_i)$ Thus there are rational maps $r_i : V_i \to G$ such that $r_i(a_i) = u_i$ where $1 \leq i \leq 3$. Furthermore, we can find an affine variety $\overline{U}$ and rational maps $\overline{P}, \pi, q$ such that: $\pi \circ \overline{P}(x,y,z) = P(x,y,z)$ and $q \circ \overline{P}(x,y,z) = r_1(x) * r_2(y) * r_3(z)$. $\square$

We are now finally ready to prove Theorem 6.2:

Proof.
Let $\{u_i, v_j, w_k \,|\, u_i \in V_1 \; v_j \in V_2 \; w_k \in V_3 \; i,j,k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be an independent set such that: $f_{i,j,k} = P(u_i, v_j, w_k)$, and set $F = (f_{i,j,k})$. By Lemma 6.4 $\alpha_F(m,n,p) = m+n+p-2$, so by Theorem 2.5 there exists a definable algebraic structure $\mathbb{G}$ (where $\mathbb{G}$ is a one dimensional group in the case of group form and field in the other cases), and independent elements: $\{a_i, b_j, c_k\} \subset \mathbb{G}$ such that: $acl(P(u_i, v_j, w_k)) = acl(h(a_i, b_j, c_k))$, where

$$h(x,y,z) = x * y * z \text{ or } h(x,y,z) = x \cdot (y+z) \text{ or } h(x,y,z) = \frac{x+y}{y+z}$$

(the operations in h are the operations of $\mathbb{G}$). In either cases, if $k' = k(a_1, b_1, c_1, u_1, v_1, w_1)^{acl}$ then: $acl(u_i/k') = acl(a_i/k') = acl(f_{i,1,1}/k')$, $acl(v_j/k') = acl(b_j/k') = acl(f_{1,j,1}/k')$ and $acl(w_k/k') = acl(c_k/k') = acl(f_{1,1,k}/k')$. By Theorems 6.6 and 6.7 there exist an affine variety $\overline{U}$ and rational maps $\overline{P}, \pi, q, r_1, r_2, r_3$ over k' such that:

$$\pi \circ \overline{P}(x,y,z) = P(x,y,z) \text{ and } q \circ \overline{P}(x,y,z) = h'(r_1(x), r_2(y), r_3(z)),$$

(where $h'(x,y,z) = x*y*z$ in the group form, $h'(x,y,z) = x \cdot (y+z)^n$ in the field form and $h'(x,y,z) = \frac{x+y}{y+z}$ in the twisted form). However, k is an elementary submodel of k' , thus $\overline{U}, \overline{P}, \pi, q, r_1, r_2, r_3$ are definable over k as desired. $\square$

One may use Theorem 6.2 to "decompose" (in a manner we will details shortly) families of rational functions.

Definition 6.8. Let $P(x,y,z)$ be a rational function over an algebraically closed field k of characteristic zero. We say that P is 2-decomposed if there exist rational functions $h_1, h_2, h_3, v_1, v_2, v_3 \in k(x,y)$ and $u_1, u_2, u_3 \in k(x)$ such that:

1. $P(x,y,z) = u_1(h_1(y,x)\nabla^1 v_1(z,x))$
2. $P(x,y,z) = u_2(h_2(x,y)\nabla^2 v_2(z,y))$

3. $P(x,y,z) = u_3(h_3(x,z)\nabla^3 v_3(y,z))$

Where $\nabla^i \in \{\cdot, +\}$ for every $1 \leq i \leq 3$.

Corollary 6.9. *Let $P(x,y,z)$ be a rational function over an algebraically closed field k of characteristic zero. If P is a 2-decomposed rational function, then either there exist $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and rational functions $r_1, r_2, r_3, q \in k(x)$ and $\overline{P} \in k(x,y,z)$ such that one of the following holds:*

1. $q \circ \overline{P}(x_1, x_2, x_3) = r_i(x_i)(r_j(x_j) + r(x_l))^n$ *(for some $i \neq j \neq l \in \{1,2,3\}$)* *and* $\pi \circ \overline{P}(x,y,z) = P(x,y,z)$.
2. $q \circ \overline{P}(x,y,z) = \frac{r_1(x)+r_2(y)}{r_2(y)+r_3(z)}$ *and* $\pi \circ \overline{P}(x,y,z) = P(x,y,z)$.

or there exist a one dimension algebraic group $(G, *)$, rational maps r_1, r_2, r_3, q and $\overline{P}$ such that: $q \circ \overline{P}(x,y,z) = r_1(x) * r_2(y) * r_3(z)$.

Proof. If P is 2-decomposed then:

$$T = \{(S(u_i, v_j, w_k) \,|\, (i,j,k) \in \{0,1\}^3) \,|\, u_1, u_2 \in V_1 \; v_1, v_2 \in V_2 \; w_1, w_2 \in V_3\} \subset U^8$$

has Zariski dimension 4, therefore, we can use Theorem 6.2. □

We end with an open question.

Problem 6.10. If $P(x,y,z)$ is a 2-decomposed polynomial, what more can be said?

We expect a decomposition in the spirit of [1]:
There exist $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and polynomials $r_1, r_2, r_3, u \in k[x]$, such that $P(x_1, x_2, x_3) = u(r_i(x_i) \cdot (r_j(x_j) + r_l(x_l))^n)$, where $i \neq j \neq l \in \{1,2,3\}$ or $P(x_1, x_2, x_3) = u(r_1(x_1)\nabla^4 r_2(x_2)\nabla^4 r_3(x_3))$, $\nabla^4 \in \{\cdot, +\}$.

References

[1] Tao, Terence. Expanding Polynomials Over Finite Fields Of Large Characteristic, And A Regularity Lemma For Definable Sets arXiv:1211.2894

[2] Hrushovski, Ehud. Expanding comments

[3] Pillay, Anand. Geometric Stability Theory. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996. Print.

[4] Hrushovski, Ehud, and Boris Zilber. Zariski Geometries. Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society 28.2 (1993): 315-324. Web.

[5] Bouscaren, Elisabeth. Model Theory And Algebraic Geometry. Berlin: Springer, 1998. Print.

[6] Poizat, Bruno. Stable Groups. Providence, R.I.: American Mathematical Society, 2001. Print.